

REMARKS:

In the above-identified Office Action Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for use of the term “pores”, wherein in there was no antecedent basis for that term. By this response, however, independent Claim 1 has been amended to refer to the pores which are recited in Claims 6 and 7. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections of Claims 6 and 7 based on 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been overcome.

Also, Claim 9 was rejected as providing no antecedent basis for the term “detection material”. That term has been deleted from Claim 9, wherefore it is believed that Claim 9 is now in good form. Also, Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, but that claim has been cancelled by this response.

With respect to the rejections based on prior art, Applicants’ note that various ones of the claims were rejected as being anticipated by the cited Choi patent or as being obvious in view of the Choi patent when combined with the disclosures of the Fukutani, Webb, and Hijikihijawa patents. On the other hand, it is noted that Claims 6 and 9 have been identified as being allowable if amended so as not to depend from a rejected claim. By this response, however, independent Claim 1 has been amended so that it provides antecedent basis for use of the word “pores” as discussed above, and so that it specifies that the average pore diameter of the pillar-shaped pores is 50 nm or less. It is believed that these changes to independent Claim 1 render that claim patentably distinct over the cited references. Looking specifically to the primary rejecting reference, namely, the Choi patent, it is believed that the disclosure therein of a memory device does not suggest in any way Applicants’ claimed porous body having pillar-shaped pores wherein the detected material is introduced in the pores. Also, the dependent claims provide additional patentable distinctions over the Choi patent.

Moreover, the secondary references relied upon in the Office Action do not overcome the deficiencies of the Choi patent as a rejecting reference.

For these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, and 3-9 are allowable wherefore the issuance and Notice of Allowance is solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3939.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 630726v1